

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 SOLOMON FARR,

12 Plaintiff,

2:05-cv-0847-GEB-DAD-PS

13 vs.

14 CITY OF FAIRFIELD, et al.,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 \_\_\_\_\_/  
17 Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed the above-entitled  
18 action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate  
19 Judge pursuant to Local Rule 72-302(c)(21).

20 On September 9, 2005, the magistrate judge filed  
21 findings and recommendations herein which were served on  
22 plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any  
23 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed  
24 within twenty days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the  
25 findings and recommendations.  
26

1           Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy  
2 of the findings and recommendations was returned, plaintiff was  
3 properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep  
4 the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant  
5 to Local Rule 83-182(d), service of documents at the record  
6 address of the party is fully effective.

7           The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings  
8 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the  
9 magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED  
10 that:

11           1. The findings and recommendations filed September 9,  
12 2005, are adopted in full; and

13           2. This action is dismissed without prejudice. See  
14 L.R. 11-110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

15 DATED: October 24, 2005

16                               /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.  
17                               GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.  
18                               United States District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26